

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by Ellingsberg (United States patent no. 6,371,861). Also, the Examiner has indicated that the allowability of claims 1 through 8 was withdrawn in view of the Kooker reference (United States patent no. 3,658,328).

Very courteously, the Examiner has suggested telephonically that a means plus claim could overcome the rejection. Applicant has, accordingly, amended claim 1 (and made a corresponding amendment to claim 2), indicating the manner in which a support must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. The requisite antecedent basis is found within paragraphs 0007 through 0010 of the present application.

Indeed, neither Ellingsberg nor Kooker indicates has a limitation causing a table to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully suggests that amended claim 1 is not anticipated either by Ellingsberg or by Kooker.

35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has also indicated that claims 2 through 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellingsberg.

Since, however, claims 2 through 8 all depend upon claim 1, Applicant respectfully observes the preceding discussion demonstrates that claims 2 through 8 are not now unpatentable over Ellingsberg.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow claims 1 through 8.

DATED this 7th day of August, 2006.

Respectfully,

Duane D. Giles

By Thompson E. Fehr
Thompson E. Fehr
Attorney
Registration No. 31353
(801) 393-6292

Attorney's Address:

Suite 300
Goldenwest Corporate Center
5025 Adams Avenue
Ogden, Utah 84403